

## REMARKS

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of this application as amended. Claims 1-5, and 16-18 are pending in the application. Claims 1, 16, and 17 have been amended. Claim 3 has been canceled. Claim 18 has been added.

Applicants have amended claims 16 and 17, particularly to overcome the Examiner's rejection of indefiniteness under 35 U.S.C. §112 and to more clearly distinguish the invention from the prior art cited. The Examiner initially rejected claims 16 and 17 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph. Accordingly, Applicants have amended claims 16 and 17 to particularly point out and distinctly claim, in full, clear, concise and exact terms, the subject matter which Applicants regard as his invention. Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to withdraw the rejection under §112.

Applicants respectfully submit that two distinct claims were inadvertently numbered as claim 3 in the application as filed. The first claim 3, which states, "The package of claim 1 further comprising a resistor coupled to the coil." has been canceled. The second claim 3, which states, "The package of claim 1 wherein the traces are wire-bonded to the wires." has been renumbered as claim 18. The Examiner is respectfully requested to enter the amendments.

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-2, and 16-17 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Choi et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,292,084 ). Furthermore, the Examiner rejected claims 1-2, 4, and 16-17 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Evans et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,543,773). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections.

Claim 1 as amended teaches a package comprising a resistor on the same surface of the substrate coupled to a coil. In contrast, neither Choi nor Evans discloses a resistor coupled to a coil. Therefore, neither Choi nor Evans anticipates claim 1. However, the Examiner cited Hastings et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,430,613) to argue that Hastings discloses an integrated circuit package including a coil structure formed on a substrate and coupled to at least one resistor (Office Action, p. 5, first paragraph). It is

respectfully submitted that Hastings discloses that electrical components are mounted on the second side of the ceramic substrate while the coil is on the first side of the substrate (Hastings, col. 3, lines 12-15; lines 19-22; lines 49-55; Figures 5 and 6). In contrast, claim 1 teaches a resistor coupled to the coil on the same surface of the substrate as the coil. Therefore, a combination of Hastings and Evans does not disclose every limitation in claim 1. It is respectfully submitted that claim 1 is patentable over Choi, Evans, and/or Hastings. Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to withdraw the rejections.

Claims 2, 4, and 18 depend from claim 1, and therefore, Choi or Evans does not anticipate claims 2, 4, and 18 for at least the same reason discussed above with respect to claim 1. Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to withdraw the rejections.

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claim 5 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Evans in view of Hastings et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,430,613). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections. Since claim 5 depends from claim 1, claim 5 is patentable over Evans in view of Hastings for at least the reason discussed above with respect to claim 1. Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to withdraw the rejection.

The Examiner rejected claims 16 and 17 under §102(e) as being anticipated by Choi and under §102(b) as being anticipated by Evans. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections for the reason discussed above with respect to claim 1. The Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the rejections.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that the rejections have been overcome by the amendments and the remarks and withdrawal of these rejections is respectfully requested. Applicant submits that claims 1, 2, 4, 5, and 16-18 as amended are now in condition for allowance and such action is earnestly solicited.

Please charge any shortages and credit any overcharges to our Deposit Account  
No. 02-2666.

Respectfully submitted,  
BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Dated: 7/21, 2003

C72  
Chui-Kiu Teresa Wong  
Attorney for Applicant  
Registration No. 48,042

12400 Wilshire Boulevard  
Seventh Floor  
Los Angeles, CA 90025-1026  
(408) 720-8300

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited  
with the United States Postal Service as first class mail with  
sufficient postage in an envelope addressed to the  
Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA  
22313-1450 on 7/21/03.

Juanita Briscoe  
Juanita Briscoe

7/21/03  
Date